

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**FILED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**JUN 11 2019**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MICHAEL SKIDMORE, AS TRUSTEE  
FOR THE RANDY CRAIG WOLFE  
TRUST,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LED ZEPPELIN; JAMES PATRICK  
PAGE; ROBERT ANTHONY PLANT;  
JOHN PAUL JONES; SUPER HYPE  
PUBLISHING, INC.; WARNER MUSIC  
GROUP CORPORATION; WARNER  
CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC.; ATLANTIC  
RECORDING CORPORATION; RHINO  
ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-56057

D.C. No.

2:15-cv-03462-RGK-AGR

Central District of California,  
Los Angeles

**ORDER**

MICHAEL SKIDMORE, AS TRUSTEE  
FOR THE RANDY CRAIG WOLFE  
TRUST,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

WARNER/CHAPPELL MUSIC, INC,

Defendant-Appellant.

and

LED ZEPPELIN; JAMES PATRICK  
PAGE; ROBERT ANTHONY PLANT;  
JOHN PAUL JONES; SUPER HYPE  
PUBLISHING, INC.; WARNER MUSIC  
GROUP CORPORATION, ATLANTIC  
RECORDING CORPORATION; RHINO  
ENTERTAINMENT COMPANY,

Defendants,

No. 16-56287

D.C. No.

2:15-cv-03462-RGK-AGR

**THOMAS**, Chief Judge and En Banc Coordinator:

In order to clarify the scope of en banc rehearing in these cases, “[w]hen a case is heard or reheard en banc, the en banc [court] assumes jurisdiction over the entire case, see 28 U.S.C. § 46(c), regardless of the issue or issues that may have caused any member of the Court to vote to hear the case en banc.” Kyocera Corp. v. Prudential-Bache Trade Servs., Inc., 341 F.3d 987, 995 (9th Cir. 2003) (quoting Summerlin v. Stewart, 309 F.3d 1193, 1193 (9th Cir. 2002)). Although “the en

banc [court] may, in its discretion, choose to limit the issues it considers, . . . the en  
banc [court] is under no obligation to do so.” Id.